

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 6A-6C. This sheet, which includes Figs. 6A-6C, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 6A-6C.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 are pending in the present application; Claim 2 having been amended and Claims 6-13 having been canceled by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Election Requirement was discussed, Figures 6A-6C were objected to; the title was objected to, the Abstract was objected to; and Claims 2, 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,590,165 to Takada et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,380,065 to Komai et al.

The outstanding Office Action has addressed the issue of the Election/Restriction Requirement. In the Restriction Response filed December 3, 2007, Applicants elected Group I containing Claims 1-5 readable on Species I (Figure 1). The outstanding Office Action indicates that only Claims 2, 3 and 5 read on Species I. However, Claim 1 is believed to be included in Species I and is supported by Figure 1, and/or Claim 1 is generic. If it is believed that Claim 1 is not supported by Figure 1 and/or is believed not to be generic, the next Official Action is respectfully requested to point out which figure Claim 1 corresponds to and/or an explanation as to why Claim 1 is not generic. Accordingly, an action on the merits of Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom is respectfully requested.

Figures 6A-6C were objected to as not containing an appropriate legend. In response to this objection, Figures 6A-6C have been labeled “Related Art.”

Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

The Title was objected to as not being descriptive. In response to this objection, the Title has been amended to the form suggested by the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, the objection to the Title is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takada et al. in view of Komai et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the amended claims.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite further details of forming of the electroless plating layer. Specifically, the forming of the electroless plating layer is now recited in the amended form of Claim 2 as being formed “without contacting the core material.” Such a feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by any prior art of record, either alone or in combination. The amendment is supported in the specification at page 10, line 12 to page 11, line 22, and page 15, line 26 to page 16, line 2 of the specification, for example.

In the outstanding Office Action, it was asserted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Takada et al. by utilizing the process of Komai et al. To the contrary, the amended form of Claim 2 now has a specific feature that the electroless plating layer is formed without contact with the core material. This prevents the opening of the via hole from being blocked due to an increase in the thickness of plating at the portion where the core material protrudes from the inner wall surface of the via hole, where the increase in thickness of plating may generate voids in the conductor part which increases the electric resistance thereof and deteriorates the heat dissipation properties thereof. See, e.g., p. 10, line 12 to p. 11, line 22 of the specification.

Neither Takada et al. nor Komai et al. disclose or suggest such a specific feature as recited in the amended form of Claim 2. Further, neither Takada et al. nor Komai et al. disclose or suggest the recognition of the technical background of the specific feature of the present invention. Consequently, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious to achieve the invention as recited in the amended form of Claim 2 that an electroless plating

layer is formed in close contact with an inner wall surface of the via hole without contacting the core material.

Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 2 and each of the claims depending therefrom is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

James J. Kulbaski
Registration No. 34,648
Attorney of Record

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)